



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/549,347	09/14/2005	Norbert Lesch	DE 030084	6708
24737	7590	11/01/2007		
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 3001			VU, JIMMY T	
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2821	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/549,347

Applicant(s)

LESCH ET AL.

Examiner

Jimmy T. Vu

Art Unit

2821

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9-11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/28/07.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 07/24/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues:

- a) Kim and Vrionis, taken singly or in combination, do not disclose or suggest a coaxial screening system enclosing a discharge vessel.
- b) Kim fails to disclose the screening serves as a supply line and electrically connected to one of the electrodes.

Examiner disagrees:

- a) Kim discloses the vessel (2, Figs. 4-7) which has the electrodes (2a, 2b, Figs. 4-7, column 2, lines 62-63) in side the screen (6, Fig. 4). Vrionis discloses a conductive translucent screen (10, Fig. 3, column 5, line 68, column 6, lines 65-66). Therefore, the combination of Kim and Vrionis would disclose a screening system in a form of coaxial or surrounding or covering.
- b) Kim in Fig. 4 discloses the screening (6) serves as a supply line [for supplying the illumination of light] and electrically connected to one of the electrodes (2a, 2b, Fig. 4).

So, with the explanation as above, the examiner believes the rejection is proper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. Patent 6,459,203) in view of Vrionis et al. (U.S. Patent 5,397,966).

Regarding claim 1, Kim discloses a lamp apparatus as shown in Figs 4-7 with a discharge vessel (2, Fig. 4-7), electrodes (2a, 2b, Figs. 4-7, column 2, lines 62-63) projecting into the discharge vessel (2), a screening (6, Fig. 4, column 2, line 60) which screens the discharge vessel (2) and comprises connection means (4, 5, column 2, lines 64-65, 8, column 3, line 42) for providing an at least high-frequency connection between the screening (6) and a screening (1) of an electrical system used for operating the gas discharge lamp (2) so as to form a coaxial (wire) screening system enclosing the discharge vessel (in side the screening (6)) with the electrodes (2a, 2b) during operation of the gas discharge lamp (2).

Kim does not specific disclose the screening (6) being screened by a translucent electrical conductor material.

Vrionis shows a discharge lamp having an envelop (6) screened by a conductive translucent material (10, column 5, line 68, column 6, lines 65-66).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a material as an translucent electrical

conductive used for screening as taught by Virionis employed in the apparatus of Kim in order to provide a shielding characteristic and prevent electromagnetic radiation.

Regarding claim 2, the combination of Kim and Vrionis discloses the housing (6) (Fig. 4 of Kim) acts as an outer bulb surrounding the discharge vessel (2) (Fig. 4 of Kim), and the screening comprises a grid structure of conductive material (screening 10 in Fig. 3, col. 5, line 67 to col. 6, lines 1-7 of Vrionis) arranged in a wall of outer bulb (Fig. 3 of Vrionis).

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Kim and Vrionis discloses the screening (10) (Fig. 3 of Vrionis) has an at least high-frequency connection (2a, 2b) (Fig. 4, col. 2, lines 60-65 of Kim) to the screening of the electrical system used for operating the gas discharge lamp in two mutually opposed locations (opposite in the long side in Fig. 4 of Kim) of the gas discharge lamp during operation thereof.

Regarding claim 4, Kim discloses at least one of the electrodes (2a, 2b) (Fig. 4) is electrically connected to a supply line (3a, 3b, 3c) (col. 2, lines 6-65) comprising a screening (1) (Fig. 4), and the screening (6) (Fig. 4) of the gas discharge lamp is connected with electrical conduction to the screening of said supply line (3) (Fig. 4).

Regarding claim 5, Kim discloses by a supply line (3) extending inside the screening (6) connected to one of the electrodes (2a, 2b).

Regarding claim 6, Kim discloses the screening (6) connected with electrical conduction to a screening (1) of a lamp holder (8) during operation of the gas discharge lamp.

Regarding claim 7, Kim discloses the screening (6) serves as a supply line [for supplying the illumination of light] and electrically connected to one of the electrodes (2a, 2b).

Regarding claim 8, Kim discloses the electrode (2a, 2b) connected to a supply line (3a, 3b, 3c), which is arranged in parallel to the screening (6).

Regarding claim 12, Kim as disclosed in column 1, lines 18-22 that the lamp apparatus being capable of used in a headlight or luminaire.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 9-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

None of the prior arts teaches or suggests or obvious in combination of a light emitting display, particularly, "an inductive element included in the additional line, the screening of the gas discharge lamp is coupled to the screening of the lamp holder via a capacitive component, and the screening is connected to the other electrode via a capacitive component" (claims 9-11).

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jimmy T Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-1832. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F: 9 - 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas W. Owens can be reached on (571) 272-1662. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2800.

Jimmy Vu

October 29, 2007

 10/29/07

DOUGLAS W. OWENS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER